The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI. ST. LOUIS, MO., JUNE 2, 1904. No. 22.

THE PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN.

UNDER the title, 'The Roman Pronunciation of Latin,' Rev. John B. Scheier, C. S. C., Professor of Latin in the University of Notre Dame, Indiana, has issued a neat little pamphlet of seventy pages (Notre Dame, Indiana, University Press.)

Latin is a dead language; consequently we have no uninterrupted tradition of a living nation to guide us in determining the true sound belonging to its idioms. There are, however, various scientific means of raising the dead and ascertaining the correct pronunciation; for instance: inscriptions, Greek transliterations, etc. Leaving these aside, Father Scheier in his booklet opens up another source by citing the Old Latin grammarians, beginning from Terentius Varro, B. C. 116, down to Venerable Bede in the seventh century after Christ. In this manner we learn from the lips of competent and impartial contemporaries what their own language sounded like. We have here "expert testimony."

One might perhaps on principle object to this method, on the ground that it must ever remain somewhat doubtful if we are at all able to measure the nature and value of all Latin sounds by mere recourse to the old grammarians. For instance, when the author says, p. 9: "the letter A corresponds to Greek alpha," we would ask: how does this appear from the quotation of the grammatici? And when these bid us put the lips and tongue and teeth in this position or that, if we would pronounce a certain letter, we may again ask: are we absolutely sure that we understand their directions and utter the precise sound they intended? But it must be admitted that, if those old grammarians do not say the whole truth, still what they do say, is true. As far, therefore, as their testimony actually goes, it is reliable and even conclusive—

though in a few cases it does not seem to be as complete and explicit as one would wish. Besides, as the old grammarians are not our only source of information, there can be little room for doubting the correctness of the author's conclusions. We believe him, therefore, to be justified in restricting his attention to the old grammatici, and, in doing so, he merely illustrates one aspect of the many which his subject presents.

The author has acquitted himself of his task with credit. In a simple, orderly manner, he takes up one after another the letters, the vowels, the diphthongs, and the consonants, premising at the head of each chapter his own conclusions from the testimonies of the grammatici; then follow these verbatim in Latin with here and there a comment by the author. One obtains, in this way, a sufficient insight into the "wealth of proof" for the Roman pronunciation. As to his own comment, the author might be a little more lavish at times, as it is easy, in some passages, to miss the sense of the grammarians. Try, for instance, on p. 9, if you can make out the meaning of Ter. Maur': "Linguamque....."

There exists a lamentable confusion on the point of Latin pronunciation. Matters are certainly bad on the old continent. "For there are nearly as many characteristic pronunciations of Latin in Europe as there are nations. The Germans have one; the French have another; the English have theirs; the Spaniards and Italians differ from all these." But matters are decidedly worse in this polyglot country of ours, where each nationality drags its own racial characteristics into this apparently neutral field. True, it is a harmless exhibition of national pride; but a melancholy exhibition all the same, and a departure from the truth at that. Uncharitable as we are, we make fun of our German neighbor, if he happen to talk of Vashington, instead of Washington; but we don't seem to be aware that we are ourselves deserving of ridicule whenever we murder, e. g., the fair name of that noble Roman statesman whom some of us call Sisero, others Tsitsero, others again Chichero, his real name being, of course, Kikero.

Fortunately for Europe, there is now a systematic movement afoot—at least on paper—to revive the Roman method. In recent books continental scholars show that they fully recognize its claims. The unavoidable quota of dissenters is easily counted. Does it behoove Americans to be behind the times? We are aware of the fact that a number of high schools and colleges have adopted the Roman pronunciation. Let us, however, make a sort of American national affair of it. Without this the individual efforts, which, as we said, have been already made in various quarters of the country, will not go far to improve present conditions. Here, then, is matter for reflection worth the attention of all friends of

the classics. But it is to the notice of principals of schools, and prefects of studies in particular, that we would like to bring Father Scheier's plea for the Roman pronunciation. Tolle, lege, —but please do not stop there! On the other hand, no advocate, however enthusiastic, of the Roman method can reasonably expect that the idiom of Old Latium will ever be made to ring again in this country, in all its native purity of sound. But what we may expect, and ought to aim at, is to avoid any manifest faultiness of pronunciation; to get as near the true sound of the Roman vowels as possible; and, above all, to cleanse our pronunciation of Latin of heterogeneous elements. Let it be one pronunciation, not a mixture of all kinds of pronunciations!

IS THE SINGLE TAX THEORY AN OPEN QUESTION?

VII.

THE ARGUMENTS OF HENRY GEORGE EXAMINED.—2.

All actual ownership must rest on a clear title by which the object in question is understood to belong by right exclusively to such and such a person or collection of persons. There are various titles by which property is transferred from one owner to another, such as donation, purchase, and the like. These titles suppose an object already belonging to some owner and, consequently, they necessarily presuppose another title. Among all the valid titles of ownership there must manifestly be one which does not presuppose another, but is rather presupposed by all others. This absolutely first title is called the primitive or original title of ownership; by it objects not having as yet any owner (res nullius) are appropriated and become the property of some one.

Whilst philosophy as well as common sense teach that ownerless objects, e. g., the fishes in the ocean, things abandoned, etc., are appropriated by occupancy [res nullius fit primi occupantis, or, as the Roman law*) has it: "quod est nullius, id ratione naturali occupanti conceditur"; what is nobody's, natural reason grants to the first occupant]—Henry George insists that "productive labor" is the original title of ownership. "That which a man makes or produces is his own, as against all the world"; and "there can be to the ownership of anything no rightful title which is not derived from the title of the producer"; "this right of property" is "the only full and complete right of property. It attaches to

*) Digest. lib. 41, tit. 1, leg. 3.

things produced by labor, but can not attach to things created by God."

This theory of ownership is suicidal, as we have already stated; it makes all real ownership, common as well as individual or private, impossible. The very same argument which Henry George advances against individual land ownership, holds against common ownership of land. The people of a country or a nation or even mankind at large can not own the soil or land on which they live, because neither a particular nation nor the whole of mankind has produced the soil. The land with all its treasures, like the ocean with its numberless inhabitants, is created by God; now the right of property "can not attach to things created by God."—One may object: this principle applies to individuals, not to nations or to mankind at large; land ownership may be "morally wrong" for the individual and right for a nation or for mankind. We answer: what is essentially wrong for an individual, can not be right for a nation or for mankind; a nation must have a clear title for actual ownership no less than the individual; but according to Mr. George, "there can be no rightful title which is not derived from the title of the producer."

To the argument, as presented in his Open Letter, Henry George premises a series of postulates which, according to our economist's view, contain the very last foundations of the whole question of property. Mr. George writes to the Pope:

"Our postulates are all stated or implied in your Encyclical. They are the primary perceptions of human reason, the fundamental teachings of the Christian faith:

"We hold: That—

1. "This world is the creation of God.

2. "The men brought into it for the brief period of their earthly lives are the equal creatures of His bounty, the equal subjects of His provident care."

3. "By his constitution," Mr. George continues, "man is beset by physical wants, on the satisfaction of which depend not only the maintenance of his physical life but also the development of his intellectual and spiritual life.

4. "God has made the satisfaction of these wants dependent on man's own exertions, giving him the power and laying on him the injunction to labor—a power that of itself raises him far above the brute, since we may reverently say that it enables him to become as it were a helper in the creative work."

5. "God has not put on man the task of making bricks without straw. With the need for labor and the power to labor He has also given to man the material for labor. This material is land—man physically being a land animal, who can live only on and from

land, and can use other elements, such as air, sunshine, and water, only by the use of land.

6. "Being the equal creatures of the Creator, equally entitled under His providence to live their lives and satisfy their needs, men are equally entitled to the use of land, and any adjustment that denies this equal use of land is morally wrong."

Let us consider these "postulates" more closely. Against the first and third, or course, we have no objection. But the second we must reject as utterly false.

The equality of all men is a fiction. All are indeed equally creatures of God's bounty and subjects of His provident care, but they are by no means equal creatures and equal subjects. Nothing is clearer than the manifold differences of men. True, all have what is essential to man, a body, a soul, an intellect, a free will, the destiny to eternal happiness in the life to come. But even in essentials, how many differences in individual men! Some have a strong constitution, others not; some a powerful intellect or will, others not, etc., etc. And how many differences or inequalities in non-essentials! The pretended equality of all men is one of the most fundamental errors of Communists and Socialists, and it is precisely what Leo XIII. points out in the first place, when he speaks of the practical remedy against social evils. "It is impossible," the Pope writes, "to reduce civil society to one dead level. Socialists may in that intent do their utmost, but all striving against nature is in vain. There naturally exist among mankind manifold differences of the most important kind; people differ in capacity, skill, health, strength; and unequal fortune is a necessary result of unequal condition. Such inequality is far from being disadvantageous either to individuals or to the community. Social and public life can be maintained by various kinds of capacity for business and the playing of many parts; and each man, as a rule, chooses the part which suits his own domestic condition. Divine Providence too takes the natural differences of men, their conditions and circumstances into account.

From the explanation given in the fourth postulate it is clear that by "labor" Mr. George understands, not any human exertion whatever, but productive labor, activity producing valuable objects or enhancing values already existing. Most people, indeed, are compelled and morally obliged to engage in some kind of "productive labor," in order to support themselves and those dependent on them. It is noteworthy that Henry George points out "the power to labor" precisely as one of the main differences between man and the brute. Do not some animals show themselves possessed of a wonderful "power to labor," e. g., bees? And how much "productive labor" is done by our domestic ani-

mals? Leo XIII. calls our attention rather to another distinctive feature of man, viz., that he is endowed with reason; "on that account," the Pope says, "man must be invested with the right of having exterior things not only for actual use, but as lasting and permanent property."

We come to the fifth and sixth "postulates."

"God has not put on man the task of making bricks without straw"—certainly not, nor has he put on him the task of building without materials. "With the need for labor and the power to labor He has also given to man the material for labor"—why not also the implements needed for labor, such as spades, ploughs, axes, hammers, chisels, and all kinds of machinery?—"He has also given to man," i. e., to every man, "the material for labor. This material is land—man physically being a land animal, who can live only on and from land." In other words: as man is by nature a land animal, so he is by nature, i. e., by the Creator's will and law, a land owner.

Moreover, since all men are "the equal creatures of the Creator," they naturally are equal land owners, "equally entitled to the use of land," and, of course, "any adjustment that denies" this equality of all, as private land ownership evidently does, "is morally wrong." Thus we have happily landed at Mr. George's common land ownership! All these are "the primary perceptions of human reason," "the fundamental teachings of the Christian faith," and they "are all stated or implied in (Leo's) Encyclical"!

Let us retrace our steps and see what are the real "primary perceptions of human reason" in this question, to be substituted for Henry George's arbitrary assertions.

Man must labor. He can not labor without material to work upon. Working upon a determined material independently and for one's own purposes, is manifestly are a land independent disposal of the given material, i. e., an exercise of the right of ownership. Hence the laborer must either have material as his own, or acquire material as his own, or work for another who owns the material and from whom he can claim his wages. This disjunctive proposition is evident, truly "a primary perception of (practical) human reason." From this truth follows that God, when "laying on (man) the injunction to labor," need not have given him the actual ownership of any material; it sufficed that He gave him the power or right of acquiring such actual ownership or property.

On the other hand, no particular object and no particular portion of land is by nature in any particular manner connected with a particular individual, as is necessarily the case when one can

vidual man any actual property. Common ownership there is none either by nature. For there is no title on which such ownership might be based. Moreover, common ownership would be useless, because man has his individual wants and needs individual property.

Accordingly, if we consider nature and the things of nature previously to any activity on the part of man and simply as things created by God, none of them are actually owned by any one; they are all "res nullius," objects without owner, though in general destined for the benefit of mankind. But since man needs property, he must have been invested by the Creator with the right of appropriating—by occupancy—whatever he deems fit to satisfy his various wants, out of the things offered by nature and not yet appropriated by others.

The right of acquiring property is essential to man; it alone follows from man's natural needs and from his power to labor. It is a general right not only in as much as it belongs to all men alike, but also because it refers to all material things that are by their nature capable of being held in individual possession. Of such a nature are evidently all those which we at present see in private possession, i. e., the soil as well as movable goods. The general right of acquiring property is exercised and applied in different ways; first of all by occupancy, where or as long as ownerless objects are at hand, then by labor and the various transactions which constitute the secondary or derived titles of ownership.

Thus, whilst by nature all things are ownerless, but appropriable by any one—"naturâ omnia sunt communia, scl. negative," as Scholastic philosophers express it—and all men are by nature endowed with the same right of acquiring property, the actual appropriation in all cases proceeds from man's activity, and is naturally very manifold, according to individual choice, ability, and opportunity; and, we must add, according to the dispositions of the civil law, which in civilized society must not only protect the natural rights of property, but also frequently determine or regulate them as to their actual application.

This is the natural right theory of ownership. It is the common sense theory as well as the theory of Scholastic philosophy. It is the theory clearly indicated in the words of the Encyclical Rerum Novarum: "If it is said that God gave the earth to mankind in common, this is not to be understood as if he wanted the common ownership of the earth vested in all men, but because he did not assign to any one the possession of any particular portion of the earth, leaving the actual distribution of private possessions to men's industry and to the laws of peoples."

From what we have said on the real basis and nature of owner-

ship, the reader will readily understand how groundless, superficial, and sometimes even frivolous is what Henry George has advanced from the ethical standpoint against the existence of private property in land. In his publications one finds plenty of bold assertions, wild exaggerations, rhetorical declamations against land owners and speculators in land, besides catching comparisons or illustrations which upon close examination prove nothing. But one looks in vain for sound and conclusive reasoning. His only argument, as we have seen, proves too much and shows thereby that his own tenet of common land ownership is nothing but a fanciful notion. Yet this notion is the only basis for the system of taxation recommended by him as the panacea for the evils by which society is afflicted.

(*To be continued.*)

ANOTHER MASONIC PERVERSION OF SCRIPTURE.

We note another perversion of Scripture in speaking of the priesthood of Masonry. It is found in the Masonic Ritualist, pp. 431—432, and is as follows:

"For this Melchizedek, King of Salem, priest of the most High God (who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings and blessed him; to a whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; first being by interpretation, King of Righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is, King of Peace; without father, without mother, without descent; having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God) abideth priest continually. Now consider how great this man was, unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils. And verily they that are of the sons of Levi, who receive the office of the priesthood, have a commandment to take tithes of the people, according to the law, that is of their brethren, though they come out of the loins of Abraham. For he testifieth, Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek. And in as much as not without an oath was he made priest. For those priests (under the Levitical law) were made without an oath; but this with an oath, by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not repent, thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek" (Heb. vii, 1—6.)

The "slight and necessary omission" here is the same as in the former passage: though the whole passage treats directly of Jesus and his eternal priesthood, all mention of Jesus is sedulously excluded. Thus the Apostle ends chapter vi. by exhorting the Hebrews: "Hold fast the hope set before us. Which we have as

an anchor of the soul, sure and firm and which entereth in even within the veil; where the forerunner Jesus is entered for us, made a high priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech." Then follows ch. vii., explaining the character and prerogatives of Melchisedech as typifying the priestly character of Christ. The type is taken and applied to the Masonic priesthood, but there is no mention of our Lord. And how could there be? This would be to go to unwarrantable lengths in a "sectarian" interpretation. "The Jew and the Moslem, the Brahman and the Buddhist, could not conscientiously partake of such illumination." It would destroy the universality which is the boast of Masonry. In such a language though citizens of every nation might converse, at such an altar men of all religions could not kneel; to such a creed disciples of every faith could not subscribe. Masonry, religious Masonry, whose object is divine truth, would be destroyed!!

BOOK REVIEWS AND LITERARY NOTES.

A Short Cut to Happiness. By the Author of 'The Catholic Church From Within.' With a Preface by Rev. B. W. Maturin. St. Louis, B. Herder; London, Sands & Co. 1904. Price, 75c. net.

The object of this little book is to show that the shortest and quickest way to happiness is by renunciation and self-sacrifice. The author points out some of those principles which, in the words of the preface by Father Maturin, must guide the seeker after true happiness like the compass over many a trackless way, till he is stirred by the movements of that love and the conscious presence of that Person who will make all things easy and every pathway clear.

——Students of Scholastic theology should welcome the appearance of Brassen's 'Scotus Academicus,' which is one of the chief productions of the Scotist school, and possibly the best exposition of the master's teaching. There is more reason for satisfaction at the reprint of this justly admired work because the view of the Scholastic system presented by some recent publications is, to say the least, a little one-sided. The great interest taken of late years in the writings of the Angelic Doctor has led, in some quarters, to a neglect of the other leaders of the mediæval schools. It may be hoped, however, that the Franciscan renaissance of our day may promote a juster appreciation of the master mind of the Seraphic Order.—*Tablet.*

——We beg to renew our recommendation of the *Christian Mother*, a Catholic magazine for the improvement of home education, and the official organ of the Archconfraternity of Christian Mothers of America. It is published monthly by Mr. Joseph Schaefer, 9 Barclay Street, New York, has the approbation of a large number of bishops, and, what is more, merits it. In the words of Archbishop Farley: "Everything that makes for the sanctification of the home, by the distribution of sound Catholic literature, is an added blessing to the family and to society, of which the family is the root." The *Christian Mother* is the magazine par excellence for the Catholic family circle. There is also a German edition, *Die christliche Mutter.*

——Dr. Simon Weber shows in his recently published work 'Die katholische Kirche in Armenien' (Herder), an important and profoundly learned contribution to church history, that Armenia is the first country in which Christianity was raised to the rank of a State religion. Already before Constantine, and in a higher measure, the Armenian ruler Trdat put all resources of the State power in the service of the Christian faith. After its conversion, Armenia became the guardian of Christian civilization against the attacks of the mighty Sassanides. For centuries it fought the battles of the faith and only through its heroic self-sacrifice was the quiet and peaceful development of Christian civilization made possible in Europe; so that we all of us owe Armenia a debt of gratitude, which its present state of lowliness and subjugation should spur us on to pay.

——That eminent German Jesuit review, the *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* (published by B. Herder) in the first four hefte of its present volume, offers a remarkable series of scholarly contributions. We shall mention only a few. There is P. Cathrein's ethical study on "strafrechtliche Zurechnungsfähigkeit." Then there is Fr. Nix's paper on the notion, origin, and spread of charity, and on Christian charity in particular. There is an instructive disquisition by P. Bessmer on the brain and the soul. Fr. Blötzer devotes three articles to the question: "Is the Anglican Church on the way to Rome?" Fr. Kugler, the eminent Assyriologist, offers a very valuable contribution to the Bible and Babel controversy in his learned paper on the Babylonian national epic of Gilgamesch. With the large number of German students in this country who are interested in the progress of science, this admirable Jesuit review ought to have many American readers.

MINOR TOPICS.

The Character of Washington.—Mr. Martin I. J. Griffin writes to THE REVIEW:

The "ugly charge of marital infidelity" on the part of Washington, which you refer to as having "been bandied about" for many years, is one which meets every student of the under-the-surface-history of the Revolution. It is noticeable that it is only during the Revolutionary war that charges or hints or whisperings are made to apply. Is it not suggestive that the charges in British publications or intercepted letters, or the alleged testimony in British army trials, are of doubtful value? Washington himself complained of forged letters being imputed to him. I too, with others I know, engaged in the study of the Revolutionary war, have given attention to these allegations of immorality. I have been told where written evidence in Washington's hand could be examined. I have gone to that reported source only to find no such evidence existed there.

The late Bishop William Stevens Perry of Iowa was one whom I consulted on this matter, as he too had made investigations. He declared the charges unfounded. So have others to me. All who publicly or privately have given attention to the question have come to the conclusion that the charges "can not be substantiated."

Perhaps no one but Washington has been subjected to such searching respecting these British inspired charges and has come out untainted in character.

It is to be observed that when in camp, even in dire Valley Forge, Mrs. Washington was with him. In this, as in all other tests of character, Washington has proven honest and true. No American has had such bitter enemies among his own. They would have destroyed his power if their evil doings against him had prospered. But every assault only made him stronger.

All that concerns him has been to me of intense interest, and I have loved to treasure his words and honor his name simply from my own seekings and study of his character. His moral character is well rounded and brilliant in other respects, so why should it lack in its most essential element and so lessen the moral grandeur of his whole character which all observers have united in proclaiming. Our country never had among its honored names one surpassing in all the moral attributes him whom we delight to call the Father of our Country. Extravagance of eulogy has its justification in the endeavor to portray the exaltedness of his character and to convey to less informed minds but the figure, form or shadow of the human excellencies and greatness of this man who made our country, and without whom, as far as human judgment can determine, our country would not have been established in its freedom. Every departure from his principles and policies tends but to the destruction of the true life of our country. As for myself, I believe Washington could not have been an immoral man, else God would have destroyed his efforts. The Baltimore Council of the Church declared the Fathers of the Republic were "instruments" of the Almighty for the betterment

of the people. So I believe His graces were showered upon Washington in the natural order, and so his character remains under all tests unsullied and infamous charges "can not be substantiated."

The Habit of Ascribing Human Faculties to Animals is perhaps natural, but a Mr. Burroughs, in the pages of the *Century Magazine*, continues to protest against it from a scientific point of view. Teaching, in the sense of conveying knowledge, he does not admit to be ever practised by them, although parents may stimulate the imitative faculties of their offspring. The means of mutual intercommunication which they undoubtedly possess are limited to the conveyance of emotions or feelings [including, we suppose, the presence of danger], but have no relation to past or future, and are entirely concerned with the actually present. That they neither acquire nor hand on any accumulated stock of knowledge is of course obvious, since each generation is born perfectly equipped for its own task, and adds nothing to its automatic skill in performing it.

Mr. Burroughs speaks of the perfect unity of action of large bodies of animals, such as flocks of birds, herds of deer or antelope, or shoals of mullet or herring, but explains precision of common movement as due, not to leadership or direction, but to some influence or impulse acting equally upon all. The wonderful homing faculty possessed by many animals and insects is something differing not in degree but in kind from any form of human intelligence, and is therefore quite inconceivable by us. It is not memory, for it acts in perfectly new circumstances and surroundings, as in the case of bees whose hives are transported in boats on the Nile or other rivers, and which can yet return to them at night with the same infallibility as though they were stationary. It seems to be unequally bestowed on animals, for, though certainly possessed in some cases by both dogs and cats, there are instances in which cats and dogs alike are hopelessly lost in a city within a few doors of their own home. There are times, too, when the migratory instinct of animals seems like a form of insanity that leads them to destruction, as in the well-known instance of the lemmings, incredible numbers of which are drowned in the attempt to cross rivers, lakes, or even arms of the sea, if they happen to intervene on their line of march in their periodical migrations.

Women and Non-Catholics in Catholic Church Choirs.—The gravest difficulty arising from the Motu Proprio on the reform of church music, is that connected with the singing of women in church choirs. The Rome correspondent of the N. Y. *Freeman's Journal* (No. 3699) endeavors to clear up the situation by making a number of distinctions. "The singing during divine service is of two kinds—part of it belongs to the clergy and part of it to the congregation. In the part belonging to the congregation women have a perfect right to sing; in the part belonging to the clergy they have no right whatever, and it is only by an absurd and indecorous corruption that they have ever been allowed to do so. The part belonging to the clergy is also extended to the choir proper, which should, therefore, consist of men and boys, and these should,

whenever possible, wear the surplice and cassock. The ideal musical service, therefore, would be performed by this special choir in the special parts, and by the entire congregation in the other parts. But until congregational singing is restored, there is no objection whatever to having a select body of singers perform the parts of the service which appertain to the congregation, and in this select body women may surely be employed. At the Mass, for instance, the Gloria, the Credo, and the Agnus Dei belong to the congregation, and may certainly be sung by a select body of singers consisting of both men and women. But it is the wish, or to speak more properly, the command of the Holy Father that all who take any special part in church functions should be persons of known probity of life. The practice of having Protestants, Jews, and infidels to sing in choirs, is a corruption and an anomaly. His Holiness recognizes that there are some difficulties in the way of putting the terms of the Motu Proprio into effect, but he expects that bishops, priests, and the faithful generally will do their utmost to overcome these difficulties. Finally, all rectors of churches who persist in having the old frivolous music at their services are guilty of a breach of respect and obedience to the Sovereign Pontiff."

The French Public Debt.—If, as a South American statesman claims, the prosperity of a country is to be measured by the debts it makes, no country in the world is more prosperous than France. According to *La Nouvelle France* (vol. II, No. 6), France has a total consolidated debt of 21,366,000,000 francs; an "amortizable" debt of 7,490,000.000, and a floating debt of 1,401,000,000 francs. That alone would mean a per capita indebtedness of more than 800 francs; but outside of this enormous sum, the State pays in pensions annually 252,000,000; and as these pensions, instead of decreasing, rather increase, they represent, at 3%, a debt of another 8,400,000,000 francs, making the total indebtedness 38,657,000,000 francs, or more than a thousand francs per head of the population.

As such waste is contagious, we find the provinces also have contracted a debt of 478,000,000, and the various cities and towns 3,548,000,000 francs more. Hence the total of the French public debt amounts to more than 43,000,000,000, for which the interest foots up to 1,300,000,000 francs per annum.

Under such circumstances one should think the government would resort to economy; but on the contrary, it is constantly increasing its expenses. In 1901 the deficit amounted to 261,000,000 francs, in 1902, to 279,000,000, and this year there is a prospective deficit of 303,000,000. No wonder French "rentes" have gone down from above par to 97 at present, and the French Minister of Finance compelled an American life insurance company to buy the depreciated French papers. No wonder also that the people, now to be burdened with a lay school system in place of the suppressed congregational institutions, are growing restive. They have not arisen against those who are striving to despoil them of their faith; perhaps they will rise against those who are underming their financial credit.

For a Reform of Our Marriage Legislation.—We learn from the Chicago *Chronicle* (May 20th) that in a three-volume work entitled 'A

History of Matrimonial Institutions,' just issued from the Chicago University Press, Professor George E. Howard has epitomized the laws and regulations of the various States of the Union regarding marriage and divorce, and has brought to light many old laws and ordinances on the subject. Professor Howard finds that twenty-three States sanction the common law marriage, which he pronounces an unmitigated evil.

To stop free and easy common law marriages, to correct the divorce evil and abolish quick-action Gretna Green weddings, Professor Howard proposes to have every county divided into districts and for each district he would have a registrar appointed to license, register, and solemnize civilly contracted marriages therein and to license, register, and attend all religious celebrations of marriage.

Professor Howard favors making the age of legal majority the minimum age for entering the marriage relation.

In drawing conclusions after discussing the early marriage laws and the more modern statutes, Professor Howard concludes that divorce is beyond the reach of the lawmaker. On this point he says:

"The lawmaker can not reach the root of this matter. The fundamental causes of divorce are planted deeply in the social system, particularly in false sentiment regarding marriage. These causes can only be removed by more rational principles of education. By carefully drawn and uniform statutes, however, much can be done to render conditions favorable for reform."

Latest News on Gregorian Chant.—Pius X. has decreed that a special edition of the traditional Gregorian Chant be published in the Vatican. Instead of being termed "official" or "obligatory," it will simply be called "Editio typica" i. e., standard edition.

A few years may elapse until the same will appear in print.

The supervision of this edition has been entrusted to the V. Rev. Andrew Mocquerau, O. S. B., prior of Solesmes and editor of the celebrated 'Paléographie Musicale,' who will be ably assisted by his confrères.

This "standard edition" will present the musical text as found in the oldest manuscripts. Hence it will be either the same as the latest edition of the Solesmes Benedictines, or will show only such fews light ulterations as may be occasioned by advanced scientific research.

This forthcoming "Vatican Edition" will have no musical (rhythmic) pointing. This musical pointing which has been revived by the Benedictine of Solesmes shall remain the exclusive property of the firm Desclée, Lefebvre & Co., Tournay & Rome; publishers of the latest Solesmes books. The Solesmes books as published by the above firm, have received the papal approbation under date of Feb. 24th, 1904.

The same publishers have furthermore received the assurance that the above edition shall enjoy the same rights and privileges as the edition to be printed in the Vatican, even though differences should arise in the musical text, owing to the now redoubled scientific researches in the ancient manuscripts.—G. H., O. S. B.

Under the Heading "Why Men Don't Go to Church," the New York *Sun* (May 17th) discusses the probable reasons for the predom-

inance of women in church attendance. Some of these will be quoted here:

"If then, men do not go to church, the reason is that they have not a strong and vital interest in the religion preached. They do not believe in it, they are not devoted to it as they believe in their political principles and are devoted to the political party to which they belong."

"The reason why men do not go to church is obvious enough ..... They are not interested in the church, because they are not interested in religion." "They may think they believe, but actually they do not believe in the religion they profess."

After giving these and other reasons, the *Sun* answers the question, "How to get men to go to Church?" by the suggestion of "a revival of true and genuine religious faith."

Evidently, here is a splendid field for the numerous missionary societies so anxious for "converting" the poor natives of Porto Rico, the Philippines, Cuba, etc. Let us hope that now the *Sun* has shown them the way, they will promptly follow it.

This flattering description of the religious character of the average American refers to the present generation, brought up in the celebrated American public schools. How do the numerous advocates of this "model school system" like the result of its training, as pictured by one of the most "American" of our metropolitan newspapers?

——Professor Münsterberg of Harvard, in his new book 'Die Amerikaner,' commits something very like high treason in asserting that the Monroe doctrine is moribund. He aggravates his offence by informing Germany that everybody would gain if South America should frankly be opened to European colonization. Furthermore, he insists that as regards personal and political liberty there is no longer much to choose between free America and the effete monarchies of Europe. "This," ironically observes the N. Y. *Evening Post*, "is terrible language to hold in sight of the Washington Elm; and the fact that Professor Münsterberg's book is written in German and calculated for perusal in the Wilhelmstrasse, only makes the assault on the doctrine the more glaring. And yet devotees of the doctrine may possess their souls in patience. Professor Münsterberg agues like a logician, and asserts that, because the premises on which Monroe's message was based have changed, his conclusion must also be revised; that the doctrine is dead because it is no longer logical. But logic has nothing to do with the matter. If men or nations that depart from syllogistic rectitude perished thereby, the world would not hold the resulting slaughter. And so, though by mixing in world-politics we have done what the doctrine forbade us to do, the doctrine itself seems as lively as ever. Bagehot used to thank God that Englishmen were illogical. The saying is worthy of consideration by pundits who, like Professor Münsterberg, vainly imagine that you can slay a national prejudice by removing its undistributed middle."

——It was reported recently that the Catholic University of America contemplated the opening of undergraduate couses. An enquiry which we made from the Rt. Rev. Rector elicited the fol-

lowing information: "The opening of the undergraduate courses at the University, which was decided upon by the Board of Trustees at its last meeting, has been deferred for the present. The hope that the preparations for this work would be completed in time for announcement in the year-book now in press, has not been realized, making this postponement necessary." Dated May 23rd and signed: Jno. J. Griffin, Secretary of the Academic Senate.

From the Boston *Pilot* (LXVII, 17) we learn: "This question has been under advisement for the past two years, and its settlement vitally concerns the immense educational interests throughout the United States. The prelates do not consider that the change will work a hardship to the Catholic colleges already in existence. They believe that by the movement Catholic education will be benefited in every direction."

THE REVIEW has serious doubts on this subject; but it would be ungracious to criticize before the University has officially published its plans.

——The infantile innocence of the Philadelphia preacher who, according to a report in the secular press, recently married the principals in two notorious divorce suits, does more credit to his heart than his head. The couple were unable to secure the services of an Episcopalian minister, "because of the strict rule of the church"—so the report runs—but they discovered an accommodating Presbyterian, who seems to have regarded the Ten Commandments as nothing between friends. The easy-going minister was told that the woman, as the injured person, was entitled to remarry; and he accepted at its face value the man's story: "I made him put it virtually in the form of an oath that he stood before God as an absolutely innocent man." The worth of a dicer's oath is pretty well understood, even by the unworldly; but we apparently need instruction about a divorcer's oath, for the benefit of obliging preachers who are persuaded by a small fee and shameless importunities to bring disgrace on themselves and their profession.

——We learn from the *Pilot* (May 21st) that the chair of American history, established by the Knights of Columbus in the Catholic University at Washington, has been tendered to, and accepted by, Professor Charles H. McCarthy of Philadelphia, who made his historical studies under Prof. John Bach McMaster and had the degree of doctor of philosophy conferred upon him several years ago by the University of Pennsylvania. If Prof. McCarthy has any literary or scientific reputation, it has not yet reached the wild and woolly West. In several Catholic newspapers Mr. Martin I. J. Griffin had been proposed for this professorship; but we suppose that, not being a member of the great and gallant order of the "Knights of Columbus," he was ineligible.

——One of our friends offers a complete new set of the Cleveland edition of the 'Jesuit Relations,' seventy-three volumes, for $175. Original cost, $255.50. Apply to THE REVIEW.